

REMARKS

Entry of Amendment

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Amendment to Specification Objection – New Matter

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner objects to the amendment of March 19, 2009 to the specification at the paragraph bridging pages 19-20 for introducing new matter and is requiring cancelation of the amendment. This objection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this objection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are canceling the amendment of March 19, 2009 to the specification and placing the paragraph bridging pages 19-20 into its pre-amendment condition.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 16-17 and 23-29 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application as explained in more depth *infra*, Applicants are amending Claims 1 and 23-26 to address

the objections noted in the rejection. Applicants are also amending Claim 23 to delete, without prejudice or disclaimer, the feature of “~~wherein quantity of plasma of a gas to be irradiated is varied between a vicinity of a region at which the part of the first wiring is formed and the other region,~~” and amending Claim 26 to delete, without prejudice or disclaimer, the feature of “~~wherein quantity of plasma of a gas to be irradiated is varied between a vicinity of a region at which the part of the first wiring is formed and the other region.~~”

These amendments should overcome the objections to the claims

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, First Paragraph

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 16-17 and 23-30 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, as explained herein, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 16-17 and 23-29. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments overcome this rejection, and it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1-6, 16-17 and 29-30

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-6, 16-17 and 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiguchi et al. (US 6,599,582) and further in view of Di Dio (US 2004/0152329), optionally considering Lewis et al. (US 5,272,979). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1 and 2.

For example, Claim 1 is being amended to recite the features of “forming a liquid-repellent thin film on an insulating surface,” “irradiating the selected portion of the liquid-repellent thin film with plasma from the first nozzle to selectively provide affinity for liquid” and “applying a drop of a liquid composition to the selected portion irradiated with plasma from the second nozzle by drop discharging method.” Applicants are also deleting the phrase “~~wherein a groove is formed in the first selected portion by irradiating the first selected portion with plasma~~” from Claim 1, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants are amending independent Claim 2, for example, to recite the features of “forming a thin film having affinity for a liquid on an insulating surface,” and “forming a first pattern by drop discharging method.”

Applicants are also amending dependent Claims 4 and 5 to be consistent with the independent claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable thereover.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 23-28

The Examiner also rejects Claims 23-28 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiguchi in view of Di Dio, optionally considering Lewis, further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 7,189,654). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 23 and 26.

For example, Claim 23 is being amended to recite the features of “irradiating the selected portion of the surface with plasma of a gas from the first nozzle to selectively provide affinity for liquid,” and “applying a liquid composition having conductivity to the selected portion irradiated with plasma from the second nozzle by drop discharging method.” Applicants are also deleting the feature of “~~wherein quantity of plasma gas to be irradiated is varied between a vicinity of a region at which the part of the first wiring is formed and the other region~~” from Claim 23, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants are also amending Claim 26, for example, to recite the feature of “applying a liquid composition comprising a conductive material to the groove from the second nozzle by drop discharging method, after irradiating the first selected portion with plasma;” and are deleting the feature of “~~wherein quantity of plasma gas to be irradiated is varied between a vicinity of a region at which the part of the first wiring is formed and the other region,~~” without prejudice or disclaimer.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable thereover.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Double Patenting

The Examiner further rejects Claims 23-28 on the grounds of non statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-24 of Yamazaki (U.S. 7,189,654) in view of Kiguchi further in view of Di Dio, optionally considering Lewis et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 23 and 26 as explained above.

In light of this amendment, it is respectfully submitted that there is no double patenting. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, the extension of time, and/or the RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Dated: November 23, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.
200 West Adams Street; Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568